REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-18 are currently pending in the present application, with Claims 1, 8, 9, and 12 being amended, and Claims 16-18 being added. Reconsideration and reexamination of the claims are respectfully requested. **Applicant repeats request for a telephonic interview with the Examiner at the Examiner's earliest convenience.**

The Examiner previously rejected Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yager et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,236). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously communicated, the present invention is directed to a multimedia execution system and a multimedia file structure for used in such a system. In particular, the present invention is directed to a multimedia system having a file storage that stores multimedia file constituting multiple sequence tracks, including a performance sequence track containing performance information (e.g., MIDI data), a drawing sequence track containing drawing information, and a master sequence track that includes synchronization information for synchronizing all of the sequence tracks so as to integrate all of the sequence tracks into one multimedia file.

As also discussed previously, all of the sequence track share the same data structure constituted by a sequence of events and corresponding durations that indicate time intervals between each successive event (see Fig. 3 of the present application illustrating alternating arrangement of event and duration information; see also pages 10-13 of the present application). Applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly emphasize this aspect of the claimed invention.

Finally, Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly specify the synchronization information to include control information for controlling the progression of each of the sequence tracks so that each sequence track progresses at a desired position along a time axis (see page 15,

lines 26-27 and page 5, lines 4-10 of the present application, wherein control information is discussed specifically as being used for stopping, branching, or repeating the running operations of each sequence track).

Applicant respectfully submit that Yager does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of a multimedia file comprising a plurality of sequence tracks, each of which use the same data structure that constitutes sequence events as well as durations that indicate the time intervals between the successive events. Rather, as previously discussed, Yager discloses a video clip data file (see Fig. 2) that includes different component data files such as compressed video, audio, or image data files. Again, as explained in Col. 3, lines 26-48 of Yager, the component files are comprised of digital data that was converted from analog data using various compression algorithms, and are later decompressed during playback. These component files are simply not sequence tracks; more importantly, Yager does not teach or suggest that these components share the same data structure, or that they include alternate event information and duration information (as recited in the independent claims). In fact, while the synchronization information disclosed in Yager provide information for controlling the respective playback timing of the component files, none of the individual component files in Yager include any duration information whatsoever. The Examiner insists that Col. 2, lines 52-55 of Yager teaches the above limitations; Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to point out the specific language by which the Examiner believes these limitations are taught or suggested.

Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that Yager does not teach or suggest a multimedia file having synchronization information wherein the synchronization information includes control information that controls the progression of plural sequence tracks. Rather, the term "synchronization information" is used in a general sense the specification of the Yager, which teaches only that the information should contain "points of temporal correlation between the various

video clip components." This by no means allows the controlling of progression of multiple files such as sequence tracks, as recited in the amended claims. Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicant respectfully submit that Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, and 12 are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, Yager.

The Examiner in the final Office Action rejected Claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yager and Cherock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,569). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Yager does not teach or suggest a multimedia file having a plurality of sequence tracks wherein each of the tracks share the same data structure constituting successive events and the duration time for each successive event. Yager also does not teach or suggest synchronization information having control information for controlling the progression of the plural sequence tracks.

Cherock fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yager. Again, Cherock is directed to displaying enhanced multimedia presentation by adding to a multimedia file supplemental audio, video, and graphic content that is selectable by a user. Cherock does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of sequence tracks having a data structure constituting sequence events and duration timing information, or a multimedia file that includes synchronization information that includes control information. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 2 and 10 are not obvious in view of Yager and Cherock.

The Examiner rejected Claims 5-7 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yager and Coelho et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,196). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Again, Yager does not teach or suggest a multimedia file having sequence tracks wherein each of the tracks share the same data structure constituting successive events and the duration time

for each successive event. And again, Coelho also fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yager. Cherock is directed to preprocessing audio/video sequencing in response to possible user selection of different processing paths of the sequences. Coelho does not contain any suggestion or teachings of sequence tracks having data structure constituting successive events and corresponding duration time indicating time intervals between the events, or a multimedia file having synchronization information that includes control information for controlling progression of plural sequence tracks. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that Claims 5-7 and 13-15 are not obvious in view of Yager and Coelho.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 393032025600.

Dated: April 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
David T. Yang
Registration No.: 44,415
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 W. Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, CA 90013
(213) 892-5587
Attorneys for the Applicant